

### **REMARKS**

The undersigned attorney notes and appreciates the telephone conversation with Examiner Rosiland Rollins on August 24, 2004 regarding the above-identified application. During the telephone conversation, the undersigned attorney requested clarification as to the nature of the Section 112, first paragraph, rejection in the Office Action of July 14, 2004. The Examiner clarified that the specification should be amended to be consistent with the subject matter of claim 1. It was agreed that the rejection would be addressed if the specification were amended to specifically refer to the dissecting member being "carried by the jaws" as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, this amendment amends the specification so as to be consistent with the subject matter recited in claim 1. This amendment concerns a feature which was included as part of the originally filed claims of the above application and is shown in the drawings, and, as such, this amendment does not include new matter.

In addition, paragraph [00188] has been amended to correct an obvious editorial error. The "end 366" should be referred to as a "first end" not as a "proximal end". As this is an obvious editorial error, this amendment also does not add new matter.

This amendment is believed to address the only outstanding rejection in the above application. Entry of this amendment is


respectfully requested.  
respectfully requested.

Reconsideration and allowance are

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 2, 2004

By:

  
Renée C. Barthel, Esq.  
Registration No. 47,356  
Cook, Alex, McFarron, Manzo,  
Cummings & Mehler, Ltd.  
200 West Adams St., Suite 2850  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Telephone: (312) 236-8500

Attorneys for Applicant